



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/651,917	08/29/2003	Nathan S. Lewis	06618-369004	1073

41790 7590 02/23/2006

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL LLP
(INCLUDING BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)
12230 EL CAMINO REAL
SUITE 300
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130

EXAMINER

HANDY, DWAYNE K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/651,917

Applicant(s)

LEWIS ET AL.

Examiner

Dwayne K. Handy

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Inventorship

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1743

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lewis et al. (5,571,401). Lewis ('401) teaches sensor arrays for detecting analytes in fluids. As described in the Abstract, the sensors comprise "first and second conductive elements electrically coupled to and separated by a chemically sensitive resistor which provides an electrical path between the conductive elements. The resistor comprises a plurality of alternating nonconductive regions (comprising a nonconductive organic polymer) and conductive regions (comprising a conductive material) transverse to the electrical path. The resistor provides a difference in resistance between the conductive elements when contacted with a fluid comprising a chemical analyte at a first concentration, than when contacted with a fluid comprising a chemical analyte at a second different concentration.

Art Unit: 1743

Arrays of such sensors are constructed with at least two sensors having different chemically sensitive resistors providing dissimilar such references in resistance.

Variability from sensor to sensor is provided by qualitatively or quantitatively varying the compositions of the conductive and/or non-conductive regions. An electronic nose for detecting an analyte in a fluid may be constructed by using such arrays in conjunction with an electrical measuring device electrically connected to the conductive elements of each sensor."

The Examiner believes this passage discloses every limitation in claims 1, 4 and 5 except for regions of varying thickness on the sensor. As to the limitation in claims 1, 4 and 5, the Examiner refers applicant to several locations of Lewis ('401) to explain the grounds of the rejection. The first is column 14 (l. 50-62), where Lewis in discussing the monitoring of resistance while testing a sensor array states "...depending on the thickness and chemical make up of the film, resistance changes as large as 250% could be observed in response to an analyte."

The Examiner now refers applicant to column 11, lines 13-41. Table 3 shows a sensor array in which various compounds have been mixed with pyrrole. Sensor elements 3-5 all contain polystyrene. In discussing results Lewis states that "sensor arrays consisted of as many as 14 different elements, with each element synthesized to produce a distinct chemical composition, and thus a distinct sensor response. The resistance, R , of each film coated individual sensor was automatically recorded". Since the other teachings of the reference already cited by the Examiner teach that resistance changes are dependent upon factors such as the thickness and chemical make up of

Art Unit: 1743

the film (col. 14, 58-59), the Examiner believes that elements 3-5 – which all contain only conductive element (pyrrole) and plasticizer element (styrene) - **must** vary in thickness as this is the only explanation as to why these 3 sensors would have differing responses when exposed to the same analyte. To use the language of the Abstract, if the “variability from sensor to sensor is provided by qualitatively or quantitatively varying the compositions of the region”, then the Examiner believes that this variability between the 3 sensors comes from a difference in thickness.

For a recitation of the various limitations of the dependent claims, the Examiner refers to the following disclosures in Lewis ('401):

- Tables 1 and 2 provide a wide variety of materials of construction
- column 10, line 45 where in discussing the synthesis of working sensor models Lewis mentions “..films ranging from 40-100 nm in thickness.”
- column 7, line 40 contains a teaching of measuring responses over a period of time and processing them with a neural network.

Thus far, the Examiner has provided arguments which he believes has shown that Lewis anticipates the claims listed in the rejection. However, in the event the Examiner is mistaken in his assertion that sensors with varying film thickness are shown in Lewis ('071), the Examiner contends that this feature would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based on the information contained in the Lewis disclosure. As mentioned before, Lewis teaches that resistance changes could be observed in response to an analyte **depending on the thickness** and chemical make up of the film. Also (again citing the Abstract), Lewis states that “variability from sensor to sensor is

Art Unit: 1743

provided by *qualitatively or quantitatively varying the compositions* of the region.”

Taking these two teachings together, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the thickness of the sensors. Varying the thickness of the sensor elements would be one way to increase the response capabilities (number of recognizable analytes) of the sensor without using additional (different) materials of construction for each individual sensor.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5 to include the limitation of varying the thickness between at least two sensors. Applicant has then argued that Lewis ('401) does not teach a plurality of sensors comprising similar compositions but different thicknesses as claimed in claims 1 and 5. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and directs applicant to the rewritten 102/103 rejection above.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1743


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dwayne K. Handy whose telephone number is (571)-272-1259. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571)-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DKH
February 21, 2006


Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700